

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 50 are amended; claims 2-9 and 11-49 are canceled; and claims 1, 10 and 50 are pending in the application.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, for allegedly reciting subject matter that is not shown in the originally-filed application. Applicant respectfully disagrees, and requests reconsideration of such rejection. The amended claim recites a plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits configured to channel radiation to only one stationary radiation conduit; and the Examiner indicates that subject matter similar to such subject matter of the amended claim (specifically, the subject matter of the claim prior to the amendment provided herein) is not shown in the originally-filed application. Applicant refers the Examiner to figure 7 of the originally filed application, where a plurality of outer radiation conduits (104, 116 and 120) are shown within an annular region 122; and refers the Examiner to figure 10 and the discussion at paragraph 0055 where it is indicated that a stationary receptor may have a single stationary conduit 174 receiving radiation from the plurality of outer conduits of figure 7. Accordingly, figures 7 and 10, and the discussion at paragraph 0055, support the claim 1 recited plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits configured to channel radiation to only one stationary radiation conduit.

The Examiner indicates that applicant's figure 6 shows a one-to-one relationship for rotating conduits and stationary conduits. Applicant respectfully submits that figure 6 is a diagrammatic cross-sectional view further explained with figures 7-10, and that the figure is generic for both a one-to-one relationship of rotating conduits to stationary conduits, and a many-to-one relationship of rotating conduits to stationary conduits. Specifically, figures 6,

7 and 8 together illustrate an application in which there is one-to-one relationship between rotating conduits and stationary conduits, and figures 6, 7 and 10 together illustrate an embodiment in which there is a plurality of rotating conduits channeling radiation to a specific stationary conduit. Thus, the Examiner's contention that figure 6 shows only a one-to-one relationship between rotating conduits and stationary conduits is inaccurate, and actually figure 6 together with figures 7 and 10 illustrates the claim 1 recited relationship of a plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits configured to channel radiation to only one stationary radiation conduit.

For the above-discussed reasons, the 35 USC §112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 1 is improper, and applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of such rejection in the Examiner's next action.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner believes that language in claim 1 of "the plurality of the outer rotating radiation conduits channeling radiation to a single of the stationary radiation conduits" is confusing and difficult to understand. Without admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's contention, applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify the phrase objected to by the Examiner. Specifically, applicant has amended such phrase of claim 1 to recite "the plurality of the outer rotating radiation conduits being configured to channel radiation to only one of the stationary radiation conduits". Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn in the Examiner's next action.

Claim 1 stands rejected as being anticipated by De Boer, or in the alternative, obvious over De Boer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of such rejection.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus in which a plurality of outer rotating radiation conduits channel radiation to only one stationary radiation conduit. De Boer does not disclose or suggest such feature of claim 1. Rather, De Boer discloses an apparatus in which a single outer rotating conduit (an optical fiber 37 of figure 3C) channels radiation to a stationary unit. De Boer indicates at, for example, paragraph 0036 that additional optical fibers could be provided in addition to the shown optical fibers. However, De Boer provides no disclosure or suggestion of how the additional optical fibers would be specifically incorporated into the shown device, and certainly doesn't disclose or suggest that the additional optical fibers would be provided in a manner as recited in claim 1 such that multiple outer rotating conduits would channel radiation to only one stationary conduit. Thus, De Boer does not disclose or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is allowable over De Boer, and applicant therefore requests allowance of claim 1 in the Examiner's next action.

Claims 10 and 50 depend from claim 1, and are therefore allowable for least the reasons for which claim 1 is allowable, as well as for their own recited features which are neither shown or suggested by the cited art. For instance, claim 50 recites that the claim 1 recited rotating radiation conduits are within a shaft, and that the claim 1 recited stationary radiation conduits are within a receptor. Claim 50 further recites a coupling between the shaft and receptor that enables vacuum to be maintained within the shaft during spinning of a substrate. The Examiner rejects claim 50 over a combination of De Boer and Doitel.

Applicant notes, however, that neither of the cited references suggests or discloses the Claim 1 recited plurality of outer rotating conduits channeling radiation to only one stationary conduit, and accordingly the combination of references does not suggest or disclose such recited aspect of dependent claim 50; and certainly doesn't disclose or suggest such aspect in combination with the claim 50 recited coupling configured to enable vacuum to be maintained within a shaft during spinning of a substrate. For this additional reason, claim 50 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 1, 10 and 50 are allowable for the reasons discussed above, and applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner's next action be a Notice of Allowance formally allowing claims 1, 10 and 50.

Applicant is providing a Supplemental IDS with this response. The Supplemental IDS lists references that were attached to the Office Action of December 14, 2006 as initialed copies of IDS's that applicant had previously submitted to the PTO. However, such IDS's were submitted by applicant for related application 11/471,106, rather than for this application. The Examiner apparently copied the IDS that had been submitted for the related application and used it for this application. Applicant appreciates the thoroughness of the Examiner to bring the IDS from the related application into the present application, but out of an abundance of caution is submitting an IDS with this application to be certain that the references are appropriately submitted and considered relative to this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/7/07

By: 
David G. Latwesen, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 38,533